Site-specific objectives for Copper – Workshop and CEQA scoping meeting

Public Questions and Comments

December 7, 2006

Questions re: sources:

Does copper from State Water Project sources (copper to control algae) enter into the Bay?

> *Yes it could. If this water is used in domestic supply, it could either go down a drain and through a wastewater treatment plant, or it could end up in runoff. In either case, it is being addressed.*

Marinas and boats: Is the Department of Pesticide Regulation's (DPR) marina monitoring study available? What about results from the study?

> *Neither the study design nor the results appear to be available currently on the DPR website. The results may, at some point, be posted on this website: http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/sw/caps.htm. Staff will contact DPR regarding the availability of the data.*

What about shipping traffic, visiting freighters?

> *Shipping traffic wasn't included because the number of ships per day is relatively small; also, large ships may not use copper-based paints.*

Questions re: implementation/monitoring:

Is there much public information out there to educate consumers about the problems associated with copper usage in brakepads?

> *There isn't much public information to educate consumers. There are many brake pad formulations, and information about each specific formulation isn't available to the public. Testing all of the formulations on the market isn't feasible due to the large number of formulations.*

Do copper applications to managed lagoons have to be reported?

> *Yes. Under the Statewide General NPDES permit, reporting occurs to both the Water Board and State Board.*

Does the same standard apply to water purveyors' applications?

> *Yes.*

Suggestion: Provide management practices/suggestions for industrial dischargers that are having trouble coming into, or staying in compliance due to the water supply not meeting objectives, e.g., EBMUD water.

Comment noted.

General questions:

Why is the dividing line at the Hayward shoals?

Various lines of evidence suggest that there are several distinct zones of the Bay. In fact, the Regional Monitoring Program has recognized these distinct zones in the redesign of the program. In the toxicity testing performed for this project, there were differences in the WERs measured in stations north of these shoals compared to south of the shoals. The shoals are shallow mudflat areas on either side of deep, narrow channels carved out by rivers flowing into to the South Bay. The line used to separate the areas north and south of the shoals is an approximation of a boundary that has a more complicated geometry that is difficult to represent.

WER average values: Was there a significant difference between segments?

There were significant differences in WERs measured north and south of the Hayward shoals. There are additional statistical comparisons available in reports that can be downloaded from the Clean Estuary Partnership (CEP) website (cleanestuary.org). These statistics will also be further discussed in the upcoming Staff Report produced by the Water Board staff.

CEQA Scoping Meeting

This project won't be complete and approved before a number of NPDES permits are scheduled to be issued. How will the project impact issuances of NPDES permits?

The Water Board is issuing permits that anticipate adoption of these objectives as the CTR allows the use of WERs in developing permit limits.